

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination and appropriate fee in reply to the outstanding final Office Action dated September 10, 2007. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 35 currently stand rejected. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21 to more particularly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

The final Office Action indicates that claims 1-7, 10-22 and 25-38 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,183, hereinafter "Satran") in view of Stapleton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,175,875, hereinafter "Stapleton"). Claims 8, 9, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Satran in view of Stapleton and further in view of Haggerty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,331,983, hereinafter "Haggerty"). Claims 5, 14, 19, 29, 32-34 and 36-38 were canceled, without prejudice, in a prior response and thus the rejections of these claims remain moot. With respect to the remaining rejected claims, Applicants remarks follow.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to explicitly recite, *inter alia*, determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address in response to the final Office Action which asserted that the above recited feature was not recited in the previously rejected claims. Accordingly, based on the current amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the previously submitted arguments, which are largely repeated below, should now be considered in full. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, taken either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above recited feature.

As will be seen below, an embodiment of the claimed invention provides a multicast address that is communicated from a routing unit to a control unit. In the control unit, by searching the tables based on the multicast address, addresses of receivers of the multicast group

are indicated by the multicast address and the specific parameters of the receivers are determined. The addresses and specific parameters are provided to the routing unit where the multicast data packets/addresses are filtered in accordance with the specific parameters for each receiver of the multicast group. Then, the routing unit transmits the multicast data packets to the addresses of the receivers or transmits the multicast data packets to the filtered receiver addresses. With this arrangement, centralized, flexible and adaptive filtering based on specific filtering parameters taking into account e.g., reachability of the receiver, available bandwidth, type of terminal screen and the like, can be achieved.

Satran discloses a data transmission system which comprises a plurality of transmitters that transmit data over a broadband channel to multiple receivers (see col. 3, lines 31-33). According to Satran, a receiver can determine whether a packet should be received by masking and pattern matching bits of a received packet against stored address templates (col. 5, lines 26-35). The receiver may further process addresses through the method of Service Type filtering. In this regard, Satran discloses that service types are used in the transmission system to attach a particular organization or classification to the data that is being transmitted or received (col. 5, lines 44-50).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Satran fails to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address. The Office Action cites col. 4, lines 48-60 and col. 5, lines 33-43 in connection with the above recited feature. In this regard, col. 4, lines 48-60 relate to multicast addressing by allowing groups of receivers to be addressed based upon their service mode as Service Type filtering (see col. 4, lines 55-57). However, there is no mention in this cited passage regarding determining specific parameters of the receivers, much less determining such specific parameters by searching tables based on the multicast address. Service Type filtering, which is described at col. 5, lines 44-59 of Satran, attaches a particular organization or classification to data being transmitted or received and is unrelated to specific parameters of the receivers. Col. 5, lines 33-43 of Satran discloses further details about a masking feature to enable definition of the group of addresses that are of interest. However, this passage, and indeed all of Satran, also fails to teach or suggest

determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address as recited in independent claim 1.

To the contrary, according to Satran, a receiver determines whether a packet should be received based on address information included in a received data packet and the receiver may process the address through the method of Service Type filtering. Thus, a transmitter according to Satran has to generate the data packet with address information specific for a receiver, which is a technique that is not flexible with respect to possible changes of receiver specifics. In this regard, if the Examiner maintains the present rejections, Applicants respectfully query as to what disclosure of Satran corresponds to determining specific parameters of the receivers or, more specifically, determining specific parameters of the receivers by searching tables based on the multicast address?

Thus, for all the reasons indicated above, Satran fails to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address as recited in independent claim 1. Stapleton also fails to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address and is not cited as such. Thus, the combination of Stapleton and Satran fails to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address as recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants further note that, since Satran fails to provide any mention with respect to determining the specific parameters of the receivers, Satran also necessarily fails to teach or suggest storing, in a control unit, specific parameters of the receivers that are dependent on receiver conditions as recited in independent claim 1.

The final Office Action cites Stapleton as disclosing "the use of a table that stores multicast communication addresses (col. 7, lines 4-25)." However, even if one assumes Stapleton discloses all of that for which it is cited, namely a table storing addresses, the combination of Stapleton and Satran still fails to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address or storing, in a control unit, specific parameters of the receivers that are dependent on receiver conditions as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, Stapleton discloses a table that stores a bit mask

indicating which ports are to receive a multicast packet. However, regardless of Stapleton's disclosure relative to transmitting data packets to receivers determined from a multicast address by searching stored tables, Stapleton fails to teach or suggest that any specific parameters of receivers are stored in or determined from the tables. In fact, Stapleton is not concerned with receiver specific parameters at all.

Accordingly, since both Stapleton and Satran fail to teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address and storing, in a control unit, specific parameters of the receivers that are dependent on receiver conditions as recited in independent claim 1, any combination of Stapleton and Satran also fails to teach or suggest the above recited features of independent claim 1.

Haggerty fails to cure the above described deficiencies of both Satran and Stapleton and is not cited as such. Since none of the cited references alone teach or suggest determining the specific parameters of the receivers by searching the tables based on the multicast address and storing, in a control unit, specific parameters of the receivers that are dependent on receiver conditions as recited in independent claim 1, any combination of the cited references likewise fails to render independent claim 1 obvious for at least the same reasons described above. Independent claims 6, 15 and 21 each include similar recitations to those described above in reference to independent claim 1. Thus, independent claims 6, 15 and 21 are patentable for at least those reasons given above for independent claim 1. Claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, 31 and 35 depend either directly or indirectly from a respective one of independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21, and as such, include all the recitations of their respective independent claims. The dependent claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22-28, 30, 31 and 35 are therefore patentably distinct from the cited references, individually or in combination, for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claims 1, 6, 15 and 21.

Accordingly, for all the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-28, 30, 31 and 35 are overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/049,590  
Amdt. Dated 10/31/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 09/10/2007

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and the remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that the present claims are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson  
Registration No. 55,675

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON OCTOBER 31, 2007.**  
LEGAL02/30577214v1